

In re: Jeffrey A. Aaron et al.
Serial No.: 10/675,517
Filed: September 30, 2003
Page 7

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the present application as evidenced by the Office Action of March 24, 2006 (hereinafter "Office Action"). In response, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 to clarify that the personnel information in the database comprises both identity and status information for the personnel, which is not disclosed or suggested in the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested for at least the reasons discussed hereafter.

Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the Specification based on an informality in paragraph 12. In response, Applicants have amended paragraph 12 of the Specification as suggested by the Examiner.

Objection to Independent Claim 10

The Office Action objects to independent Claim 10 for use of the word "relating." In response, Applicants have amended independent Claim 10 to correct the use of the word "relating" for improved readability.

Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 are Patentable

Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0023722 to Vinberg (hereinafter "Vinberg") in view of U. S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0148526 to Sands et al. (hereinafter "Sands"). Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of outputting an alert and recites, in part:

...
obtaining a status from a sensor;
retrieving personnel information comprising identity and status

information for the personnel from a database, the personnel information relating to the sensor;

generating the alert;
applying a filter to determine whether to modify a severity of the alert; and
outputting the alert. (Emphasis added)

Independent Claims 10 and 18 include similar recitations. Thus, according to independent Claim 1 as amended, the personnel information stored in the database includes both identity *and* status information for the personnel. Such embodiments are described, for example, on page 8, paragraph 24 of the Specification where the text explains that the personnel information can include various identity information along with status information, such as job category and/or authorized access zones for the various individuals.

The Office Action acknowledges that Vinberg does not disclose retrieving personnel information from a database, but alleges that Sands provides the missing teachings. (Office Action, page 3). In sharp contrast to the recitations of amended Claim 1, Sands is directed to a security method and system for authenticating a person's identity based on biometric information. (*See, e.g.*, Sands Abstract and paragraphs 7, 19, 24, and 37). Applicants can find no disclosure in Sands related to authenticating a person based on a person's status, *e.g.*, job category, authorized access zones, or the like. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference or references when combined must teach or suggest *all* the recitations of the claims, and there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. M.P.E.P. §2143. Applicants respectfully submit that Sands does not provide the missing teachings related to retrieving personnel information from a database that includes both identity and status information for the personnel; therefore, the combination of Vinberg and Sands does not disclose or suggest all of the recitations of independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 as required under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Thus, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

In re: Jeffrey A. Aaron et al.
Serial No.: 10/675,517
Filed: September 30, 2003
Page 9

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 are patentable over Vinberg and Sands, and that Claims 2 - 9, 11 - 17, 19, and 20 are patentable at least per the patentability of independent Claims 1, 10, and 18.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-entitled application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (919) 854-1400.

Respectfully submitted,



D. Scott Moore
Registration No. 42,011

USPTO Customer No. 39072
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
P. O. Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: (919) 854-1400
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on June 26, 2006.



Traci A. Brown